

**REMARKS**

Claims 15 through 24 remain in the present application. None of the claims having been amended by this Response.

**DOUBLE PATENTING**

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 15 - 24 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting being unpatentable over claims 1 -14 and 17 of co-pending application Serial No. 09/684,129 and other references as noted in paragraph 1, on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action.

In light of the fact that at this stage of the prosecution, claims have not been allowed in the present application or the co-pending application, it is respectfully submitted that the submission of a Terminal Disclaimer be delayed pending the allowance of claims in either of the two cases. Applicants are prepared to file a Terminal Disclaimer at a stage when the provisional double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in the application and the other application has issued.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 15 through 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,179,201 (Chess) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,039,356 (Warther et al.). Apparently, the Examiner takes the position that the Chess patent discloses all of the features recited in claim 15 with the exception of the magnetic strips. The Examiner points to the

Warther et al. patent for that teaching. The detailed reasoning presented by the Examiner is found in paragraph 3 of the Office Action spanning pages 3 through 5.

After carefully reviewing the Examiner's comments, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 requires no additional amendments in order to be in condition for allowance. A careful review of both the Chess patent and claim 15 reveals that the Chess patent fails to disclose several critical features recited in claim 15. In order to fully understand the differences between the recited structure of claim 15 and the teachings of Chess, representative figures from the pending application and the Chess patent are presented in an attachment entitled "Sample Drawings From Pending Application and Chess U.S. Patent no. 6,179,210."

The Chess reference fails to teach or disclose a siliconize liner patch 17 containing a pressure-sensitive adhesive surface 18 that is laminated on the back surface of a carrier sheet 10 which is subsequently die-cut. The reference also fails to teach the provision of a straight fold 24 in the face patch 19 between front and rear card panels. Finally, the Chess patent fails to teach the formation of a card by peeling off the panels from the carrier sheet with the pressure sensitive adhesive 18 releasing from the siliconized liner patch 17 where by the adhesive now lies on a back face 19" of the card panels, and folding the card panels along the straight fold line 24 to firstly mate with the back face of the front and rear card panels and then the back face of the rear card panel.

Instead, Chess teaches an integrated card construction which provides for the provision of two cards as shown in Figures 1 and 3A and labeled 50 and 52. In Figure 1, two cards are shown with 61 denoting die-cut lines in order to form those two cards. The back surfaces of each card,

with reference to Figure 3a, contain a polyester film that is secured to the back surface through adhesive 58. The polyester film is temporarily secured to a varnish which holds the card construction against the backing patch 60 that is further secured to the paper stock web 12. Thus, it can be that the Chess patent offers a teaching whereby the cards 50 and 52 are separately removed from the backing patch 60 by breaking the bond created by the varnish 62. This yields two cards that have a polyester film 56 backing held in place by the adhesive 58 to the back of the die-cut cards 50 and 52. Thus, there is absolutely no suggestion or teaching for the creation of a card that has front and back panels on one face of the card and an adhesive on the back face of the card so that when the card is removed from a sheet the card may be folded along a fold line and held in place by the adhesive so that the card results in finished front and back panels.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is no longer rejectable under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Chess in view of Warther et al.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Claims 16 through 20 can trace their dependence to claim 15 and as such incorporate the limitations of that claim. Therefore, for the reasons previously presented with regard claim 15, claims 16 through 20 are likewise in condition for allowance and may no longer be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Chess in view of Warther et al.

Should the Examiner have any questions or require additional information after reviewing this Response, she is cordially invited to call the undersigned so that this case may receive an early notice of allowance. Further, as was discussed with the Examiner, if the Examiner does not

C. R. COX et al.

Serial No. 09/973,044

find the application to be allowable, then she will contact the undersigned attorney to set up an interview.

If there are any fees in connection with the filing of this Response, the Commissioner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 06-1358 for any such fees.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By:



Allen S. Melser

Registration No. 27,215

Date: October 29, 2003  
Customer No. 00,136  
400 Seventh Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 638-6666  
Attorney Docket No. P66623US1